AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Dear Mr. President:

Till you turned the Republican party towards the acceptance of collectivistic ideals, I had been a Republican. I have now severed my relationship with the party. This has been done only after serious provocation—the immediate cause having been your sending Federal troops to enforce integration at Little Rock. I cannot conceive of the necessity for such an occurrence under the party as I once knew it. Whatever the immediate provocation, this represents an instance of the profound social maladjustment that always follows attempts to force collectivistic beliefs on peoples.

You would place the indirect responsibility for your act on the Supreme Court, as can be shown by numerous statements by you and your staff. As an instance, Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams is quoted in an Associated Press dispatch of October 2, as saying:

"First, the Executive Department did not originate the (integration) plan. Secondly, the Administration is not responsible for the decision of the Supreme Court in this matter." This statement appears to free you of all connection with this collectivistic decision. However, I cannot let you off so lightly.

You appointed Earl Warren to the office of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in spite of the fact that throughout his political career he had consistently favored collectivistic causes. Or; did you choose him because of this fact? Or, did you foresee that political advantages would accrue to you through him? In any case I cannot believe that a president who objected to collectivistic beliefs could have chosen Earl Warren to so high an office.

Though I feel sure that the decision "outlawing" segregation was partly based on the improper moral conceptions that appeal to the collectivistic mind, I also believe that it was influenced by other improper factors. The political one looms the largest— employing political in its most derogatory sense. I remember that earlier court decisions had defended our right to racial apartness. However, I also remember that political observers concluded, during your first administration, that whether or not you succeeded yourself in office, might depend on the Negro vote of the North. Further I remember that your Attorney General, Herbert Brownell was active in pushing the case favor-

University of Iowa, Libraries, and Microfilming Corporation of America. 1977
. The Right Wing Collection of the University of Iowa Libraries [1918-1977 on Microfilm]
. Glen Rock, N.J.: Microfilming Corp. of America.

ing integration before the Court; and that in doing this he was on the side of the NAACP. Also, that all of this happened well in advance of your campaign for reelection. Shrewd observers were sure that political advantages would accrue to the administration responsible for "outlawing" segregation in our schools.

Because of widespread suspicion on the part of the public of the Court's motives as well as the philosophy on which it based its decision in the school case, the prestige of the Court has fallen to an all time low.

At the time that you expressed your aim to enforce the decision "outlawing" segregation through the use of Army troops, according to observers, you lost your temper. The man convinced of the propriety of his actions does not lose his temper. Can it be that you as well as a large part of the public, realized that there were elements of an improper nature responsible for the decision on which you acted?

Now a word about the decision. Many lawyers believe it illegal. It brushed aside rights guaranteed to the States. It reversed earlier decisions. Its pretension of legality is slight. Chief Justice Warren in his written decision, leaned heavily on the theories of outright collectivists. The book on which he placed principal reliance was written by a foreigner- a socialist. True Americans could not conceivably accept the beliefs expressed in it, for it declares that our Constitution has become outmoded. However, whether legal or illegal, the decision is immoral, as I will now show.

On a recent trip to Chicago I found that groups of Whites, includng the one that continues to preach brotherhood, found that they could not live and be happy in neighborhoods after integration had occurred. All availed themselves of the right to flee. However, under Modern Republicanism we find you forcing children at the point of bayonets into an association such as normal adults cannot tolerate. Certainly there is something radically wrong with an administration that allows itself to be trapped in a position where it feels it necessary to act in a way that outrages the sense of decency of normal Americans.

The vast propaganda build-up inspired by our left-wing elements has simply assumed that there is some moral worth in integration. However, such an assumption is false. It cannot be justified on any basis of reason. In the case of two individuals, we do not ask that they associate with each other in case either objects. To force such an association on them would not only be improper, but basically immoral. To force a group of children to associate with a group whom they wish to live apart from is profoundly immoral.

I recognize that there are some who "feel" that we should all be as one. These are people who are attracted to collectivistic beliefs. However, such individuals cannot, as we have seen, rationally justify their feelings. On the other hand many feel that projects of integration are improper. Such programs are repugnant to them. Here we have a case of feeling pitted against feeling. These feelings, as will be realized by the students of the humanities, partake of the nature of religions. This religious aspect is becoming widely recognized in the case of communism. So far, then, as the Court's decision was inspired by collectivistic beliefs: so far was it imposing its religion on us.

Though the belief of the Court cannot be justified in reason, the beliefs of those opposed to its decision can. This latter group have reason as well as feeling on their side. They know that our biological worth as a people is being threatened through the probability of intermarriage, should integration be inforced. Collectivists simply ignore or belittle such a threat. They brush aside the vast documentation showing the unsoundness that goes with mongrelization. Allow me to repeat that you have done a profound injury to those who do not agree with your outlook. However, this may be as nothing compared with the degradation that your program may bring to our future through a biologically degraded people.

Some of your "liberal" supporters are trying to give a color of justification for your acton on the basis that if we are to maintain world leadership we must please colored people, the world around. The strange belief that we should morally lead the world, springs from collectivistic groups. No doubt they wish to see their "advanced" beliefs forced on everyone everywhere, just as has been done in Little Rock. However, real Republicans and normal people reject all such programs. For them, almost any price, except another Little Rock, would be justified should it make impossible the ambitions of our "liberal" groups to enforce their wills on the world.

It is a characteristic of the collectivistic mind that it tries to solve problems—not by the employment of reason, but by forcing collectivistic dogmas on situations. Chief Justice Earl War-

ren's decision "outlawing" segregation is a perfect instance. It is a further characteristic of the Collectivistic mind that it cannot learn from experience. If the dogmas do not work it does not reject them; but rather developes a fanatical drive to enforce them. Unless you reject collectivism and return to Americanism there will be no end to our troubles.

Now for a realistic look at collectivism as put into practice by your administration. The attempt to end segregation in our public schools has been responsible for an alarming increase in ill-will between Blacks and Whites; between the North and the South. This program has inflicted wounds that may never be healed. It has caused Whites, in defense of proper values, to study the true attributes of the Negro, so that they are becoming aware of the Negro's limitation to an extent unimaginable a decade ago.

So completely corrupting is the philosophy of collectivism that it has taken but a mild infection of it to see its typical characteristic; the use of force to enforce collectivistic beliefs, emerge. What can you do to save the American people from further ordeals? First, you should reject all beliefs based on collectivism. With specific reference to the case before us, you should help normal Americans work for a reversal of the collectivistically inspired decision which would force our younger generation into a pattern pleasing to collectivists. This unstable Court has already reversed early decisions on a wholesale scale, and sometimes its own; one of these within one year. In case it will not reverse its own adventure into tyranny, the next best procedure would be to simply forget the Court's ruling. There are many laws on our statute books which are no longer enforced. Certainly the Court's decision should meet a similar fate.

The alleged reason for Warren's decision "outlawing" segregation was his statement that equal but different facilities are in themselves unequal. That changing this situation would bring about either equality or equality of opportunity is so absurd that I shall not waste space discussing it. However, I will mention that inequalities are inevitable. They are found throughout nature and cannot be eradicated. Montesquieu recognized that any attempt to enforce equality would lead to tyranny. The "honor" of fulfilling his prophecy rests on you. However, it is not too late to start making amends.

Sincerely yours,

BYRAM CAMPBELL

Dieth. Anti-Communist League